New York Daily Tribune

THE HON. MR. BURNS ROASTED.

We have already given a synopsis of the hubbub raised on the Lecompton side of the House of Representatives by Mr. HOARD's second actempt to ebts in an investigation of the Hon. Mr. Burne's inducements to support the Lecompton Swindle; but the subject is so interesting and the affair so piquant that we subjoin a fuller report from the columns of The Change

columns of The collection of the collection of the columns of the collection of privilege. I have received a letter, which, if read to the House, I suppose will explain that question. I desire to have it read at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the letter, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON CITY, Feb. 18, 1852.

Sta: You took occasion, on last Friday, in the House of Representatives, from the Clerk's desk, to report to said House, from The New York Takeven, to report to said House, from The New York Takeven, a foliar and foul slander acainst may the tenur of which you know without a repestition from may the tenur of which you know without a repestition from the said in the floor of this Courgese.

You reported the slander without any provocation on my part. I knew nothing of you, said nothing about you, nor of any member on your idee.

recew bothing of you, said nothing about you, nor of any me ber on your side.

The paragraph had no name to it, and you refused to indorse. I pronounced it then, as I do now, a falsehood of the kinlest kin. If you suspicion that I am guilty of the crime of heing bribed, a set forth, I ask you to examine into the truth or faisity. If you find I am innocent, it is most certainly due to me that you the in your place and set me right.

I await your response.

Yours,

I await your response. Yours, JOS. BCK.
Hom. C. B. Hoann.
Mr. Hoann-I desire to respond to that letter. Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—That is no question of rivilege to be brought before the House. I object.

The SPEARER—Objection is made.

Mr. J. GLANCY JONES—I insist upon my motion.

[To go into Committee of the Whole.]

Mr. HOARD—I desire the Speaker to decide if this is not a question of privilege—if I have not the right to

Mr. Hoards—Idealer the speaks to detect in this respond to that letter!

Mr. Florence—The gentleman can respond by writing another one. I object.

The Speaker—As the matter is presented to the Cheir now, he does not perceive that a question of privilege is raised by the letter at all.

Mr. Hoard—Is it not a letter threatening in its character! Is it not a letter calculated to intimidate!

The Speaker—The Chair thinks not.

Mr. J. Glancy Jones—I now insist on my motion.

Mr. Crawford—I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yieldato me a moment while I report to the House a bill to pay the dediciencies in the printing, integraphing, and engraving, the failure to provide for which is a matter of very great complaint upon the part of the men to whom we are inebted.

Mr. Howard—I object.

Mr. J. Glancy Jones—I cannot yield.

Mr. Howard—I desire, if the House will not give me consent to make a personal explanation, to take a respectful appeal from the decision of the Chair. I however first ask the House to grant consent as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. Florence—I call the gentleman to order.

matter of courtesy.

Mr. Florence—I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. Burnert—I object, because the gentleman can
make his response in another way.

Mr. Hoard—I withdraw my appeal.

Mr. Giddies—I wish to know if it is a friend of
the author of that letter who makes objection to a re-

SPONSE!

Mr. FLORENCE—I object, except in the way—
The SPEAKER—Debate is not in order upon either
side of the House.
Mr. Hoard—Another word, if you please.
The SPEAKER—Debate is out of order.
Mr. HOARD, thus choked down, desisted, until

quite late in the day, when, much other business having been disposed of, he rose again.

Mr. Hoard—I desire the consent of the House to follow up the reading of the letter this morning with a few remarks in the shape of a personal explanation.

Mr. Jones (Tenn.)—I call for the regular order of Mr. Florence-I object to the personal explana-

Mr. Florence—I object to the personal explanation. I have not withdrawn my objection.

Mr. J. Glarcy Jores—I ask whether my resolution for the close of the debate on the Indian appropriation bill is not pending?

Mr. Washburn (Mc.)—Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Florence) object to the gentleman from New-York making a personal explanation?

The Spraker—The Chair so understands. The pending question is on the proposition of the geutleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. J. Glancy Jones), that all debate in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union on the Indian appropriation bill terminate at 2 o'clock to-morrow; and on that the previous question is demanded. question is demanded.

Mr. Walbridge—I move that the House do now

Mr. SICKLES called for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Messrs. Kelsey and Craige of North Carolina were appointed. The House divided, and the tellers reported: Yeas 44. Nays 82. So the House refused to adjourn.

44. Nays 82.

So the House refused to adjourn.

The quertion recurred on the motion of Mr. J.

GLASCY JONES-The motion made by me
this morning was to terminate debate in Committee o
the Whole on the State of the Union on the Indian
Appropriation bill to-morrow at 2 o'clock. I propose
tow to fix Wednesday at 2 o'clock. That will allow
the whole of Tuesday and part of Wednesday. On
that I demand the previous question.

Mr. WASHBURN (Me.)—I move to lay the resolution
or that table.

dr. J. GLANCY JONES-On that I ask for the Yeas

and Navs.

The Yeas and Nays were ordered.

Mr. Sickles—I ask the gentleman (Mr. J. Glancy Jones) to withdraw the call for the previous question,

and I will renew it.

The Spraker—The question is not debatable any how.
Mr. Sickles-I want to make a statement to the

Mr. Sickles—I want to make a statement to the House, which will not occupy a mement.

Mr. Dean—I move that the House do now adjourn. The question was taken, and the motion was not spreed to; there being, on a division—Yeas 59; Nays 87.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. Sickles—I ask pemission to make a statement in reference to the misunderstanding under which my colleague (Mr. Hatch) was allowed to make his explanation.

Mr. Berrett—I object.
Several Voices—Withdraw your objection.

Mr. Berrett—I have reasons satisfactory to myself for making the objection, and I do not withdraw it.

Mr. Sickles—I desire to state that the terms on which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings) withdraw his objection to the personal explanation of my colleague (Mr. Hatch) were, that objections should be withdrawn to the personal explanation of my colleague (Mr. Hoard). I desire to see that arrangement honorably carried out by this side of the House. I therefore ask that the same courtesy shall be extended to one gentleman as was extended to the other.

Mr. Jones (Tenn.)—I ask for the regular order of business.

business.
The SPEAKER-Objection being made, the gentleman

cagnot proceed with his personal explanation.

Mr. Heare—Then I only wish to say that I am supprised that this small courtesy should not be allowed me.

Mr. Jones (Tenn.)—I object.

Mr. Hoard—Then I rise to a question of privilege.

Lamburit the following resolution.

I submit the following resolution:

Warran, A strement has been made by a member of this House importing that the Hon. Mr. Burns of Ohio has stated to him, in a wonversation on the subject of his vote on the resolution of the Hon. Mr. Harris of Illinois, to commit to a Select Committee the Fresident's Message on the Kansas investigation, that he was to have certain official paironane, or appointments to office, at his disposal; and scherots, the Hon. Mr. Burns had previously been free in his avowal of settlineats, with which his vote on that subject was in conflict, thus furnishing ground to suspect that some improper influence had been exerted to bias the said member's official action as a member of this House; therefore, Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed by the Speaker to inquise and investigate whether any improper attempts have been or are being made, directly or indirectly, by any persons commeted with the Executive Department of this Government, or by any other person, with their advice or consent, to indusence the section of any member of this House upon any question or measure upon which the House has acted, or which it has under consideration, with power to send for persons and papers, and with leave to report at any time, by bill or otherwise.

Mr. Bepsaker, the letter which was read at the Clerk's desk this morning, though dated yesterday, was received by me night before last.

Mr. BURNETT—I rise to a question of order. Is the private letter to which the gentleman refers a matter of privilege to which the gentleman can speak, and has he a right to answer that private letter in a speech upon this floor!

Mr. HOARD—I am explaining my resolution.

Mr. Sickless—Under the precedent of the other day, it will be for the House to decide whether it is a question of privilege cor not.

Mr. Burnett—I have not asked the gentleman I submit the following resolution:

Whereas, A statement has been made by a member of this
House importing that the Hon. Mr. Burns of Ohio has stated to

tion of privilege or not.

Mr. BURNETT-I have not asked the gentleman

Mr. Burserr—I have not asked the gentleman from New-York for his opinion upon the matter. I make the question that the resolution presented by the gentleman is no question of privilege. There is no charge contained in the preamble or resolution whatever against any member. It cannot be made a question of privilege unless a direct charge is made.

The Spraker—The Chair, following the precedent which was adopted the other day, and which he finds, upon examination of authorities, is fally sustained by by the precedents of the House, will submit the question to the House in this form: "Shall the resolution "he received and entertained upon the ground that "the privileges of the House are involved?" The Chair is of opinion that the question is debatyle, and the gentleman from New-York is entitled to the floor

Mr. Hoard-Mr. Speaker, the letter read this morning by the Clerk, although dated yesterday, we received by me night before last, and I endoavored yesterday to obtain the floor to reply to it. I take the earliest opportunity to respond to it. I am informed that the Hon. Joseph Burns of Ohio had been open in his condemnation of the Lecompton Constitution, and that, after the vote upon raising the Select Committee for investigation upon that subject, on which occasion he he voted against the friends of the resolution, he (Mr. Burns) said that certain Executive patronage, or appointments to office were to be at his disposal. I his is the substance, according to my information, of the admissions made by Mr. Burns to an honorable member of this House, upon being it quired of how he came to give such a vote In calling the attention of the House, the other day, to the subject out of which this letter has grown, I was actuated by no feelings of personal unkindness toward any one, and especially toward Mr. Burns, whom I do not know by sight. The charge that I made on Friday last was that I believed the Executive Department was attempting to influence the votes and action of members of this House by improper of fers of the patronage of the Government, and I cannot consent that attention shall be diverted from the real and important questions to zay incidental side issue that may spring out of it. This opinion was founded upon various circumstances which had transpired, and some of which I stated when the resolution was founded upon various circumstances which had transpired, and some of which I stated when the resolution was founded upon various circumstances which had transpired, and some of which I stated when the resolution was founded upon various circumstances which had transpired, and some of which I stated when the resolution was founded upon various circumstances which had transpired, and some of which I stated when the resolution of the House, and that it was essential that the House should institute an investiga

for a moment, I will renew the motion to adjourn.

Mr. Taylor of New-York withdrew the motion to

Mr. TAYLOR of New-York withdrew the motion to adjourn.

Mr. BURNETT—I do not intend to occupy the time of the House but for a moment or two. The reason why I objected to a personal explanation by the gentleman from New-York was, that I well understood what was to follow it. I dm opposed to gentlemen bringing their personal difficulties upon the floor of this House. It aman denounces me as a slanderer, and charges that I have traduced his character, I know how to meet that sort of charge: I will never seek to stab him indirectly. I will meet him face to face, to settle it as all such questions ought to be settled by honorable men. I knew this thing was to come up under the guise of a privileged question. I knew that an effort was to be made, under the pretense of a question of privilege, to raise a committee to investigate a charge made against a member of this body, who, in a private letter, addressed to the knew that an effort was to be made, under the pretense of a question of privilege, to raise a committee to investigate a charge made against a member of this body, who, in a private letter, addressed to the member from New-York, told him: "Sir, the charge "you made on last Friday is false and slanderous in "its character, and I hold myself responsible for what is say." The gentleman from New-York, instead of responding to the letter addressed to him as an individual, as it should have been replied to, brings it into this House; and, without any action on the part of the gentleman from Ohio, and without his consent, makes it public. It was a private letter to the gentleman from New-York, who made the charge, declaring that the charge was false and slanderous, and that for so branding it he was responsible. Instead of responding to that letter the gentleman from New-York comes here and spreads it upon the record, and makes it a part and parcel of our proceedings. Then, he claims the right to make a personal explanation to meet that private letter. I am always ready to give every man a fair and full opportunity to vindicate himself from charges of a public character. I will never heritate, by my vote, to vindicate the character and reputation of any member upon this floor; but I will never permit any man, by my vote, to ranse a committee, without good cause, to blast and ruin the character and reputation of one of my peers. In the response read by the gentleman from New-York to this House, what is the charge? The charge is, that in a private conversation with some honorable member upon this floor (I do not know who), the gentleman from Ohio admitted that he was to have control of some Executive appointments. Admit that the member upon this floor (I do not know who), the gentleman from Sew-York to the House, what is a well known rule of law that such testimony is of the weakest character. In what can it result? Here stands the assertion of one member upon one side who is entitled to credit, that the charge is alse

-If anybody supposes that the Hon. Mr. BURNS would like to have this matter investigated, we would thank him to urge that gentleman to make the motion. It is not likely to be resisted on the Anti-Lecompton side of the House. And if any one supposes Mr. BURNETT of Kentucky knows no better than to represent this as a personal matter between Messrs. Hoard and Burns, he does that gentleman's understanding gross injustice.

THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

REPORT OF THE HON. JAMES L. GREEN OF MISSOURI.

From the Committee on Territories, on the admission of Kansassa a State; made in the Schate, February 18, 1858.

The Compaittee on Territories, to whom was referred the Message of the President, communicating a Constitution for Kansas 53 a State, adopted by the Convention which met at Lecompton on Monday, the 4th of September, 1857, having had the same under corsideration, instruct me to report:

of September, 1857, naving had the same date? Consideration, instruct me to report:

By the treaty with France, made on the 30th day of April, 1803, known as the Louisiana Treaty, Kausas was acquired, with a special stipulation for the protection of the rights of the inhabitants, and for the admission of such States as might be formed out of that Territory into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. This solemn tresty obligation has been heretofore faithfully observed, and the States of Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas and lows have been respectively admitted into the Union; and another part of the territory acquired under that treaty, included in the proposed State of Minnesota, is now about to be likewise admitted. Kansas has the same right to expect the same treatment in the fulfillment of sacred treaty obligations, made with one of the first powers of the world.

In view of these obligations, and in strict conformity with the uniform practice of the Government in fulfillment thereof, eithers of the United States have settled in Kansas under the jos expectation of having a State organization. And to protect the people and enable them to prepare for such an organization, Congress, on the 36th day of May, 1854, passed an act creating a government for that Territory.

That act, following up the constant practice of the Government, and in fulfillment of the treaty with France, contemplates a charge of its form into that of a State, and for admission into the Union.

Union.
Union the act of Congress aforesaid a regular Territorial Government was organized, and the people of the Territory were thereby constituted a political community, with full powers of severnment, subordinate only to the Constitution of the United Sates, and proceeded to pass laws for the protection of persons and proceeding the state of the protection of persons and property, the validity of which cannot now be called in question. Soon after the Territorial Government went into operation a party of disaffected persons formed combinations to resid the laws and set at defiance both the Territorial and United States Governments.

party of disarrcers persons formed combinations to resist the laws and set at defiance both the Territorial and United States Governments.

To that end they proceeded to form an organization, and although the population at that time amounted to less than twenty five tho used inhabitants in the entire Territory, and they constituting a small minority of that number, yet, in order to resist the legal authorities under the color of law, not up as the gal assembly at Topeka, and actually pretended to organize a State Government, and this, too, without a Congressional enabling act; without the assent of the Territorial Legislature, will out a vote of the people authorizing the electron of a convenient, but in disregard of all. That same party has been perdeent in its illegal efforts to maintain its own organization; will discuss that the distance of law and to defeat and prevent the operation of all law-mad the actions not of all questions affecting the scarce of Konsa-To accomplish its ends they concoped and effected a secret military organization of their findiconterity, pedieded to resist the legal authorities, and actually received Sharp's rifles and other many and maintains of war which were east out from Maccachisette and morning the scarce of from Maccachisette.

SEC. 3. Officers, as above, shall file in office of Probate Judge a complete list of all qualified voters readent in his county or district on the first of April, 1857.

SEC. 4. Copies of said list to be posted in public places.

SEC. 5. Probate Judge to continue Court from receipt of said returns to lat of May for the purpose of correcting them.

SEC. 6. Lists of legal voters, as corrected, to be returned to the Governor and Secretary, and distributed generally.

SEC. 7. Upon completion of census, apportionment of members to be made by the Governor and Secretary, according to the registered voters. Number of representatives to be saity.

SEC. 8. Election for members of the Constitutional Convention shall be held on the third Monday in June, and no one, unless registered shall votes; some shall appoint the places of voting, Judges of election, &c.

SEC. 10. Judges of election are required to be sworn; also the Clerks, and duplicate returns of election shall be made and certified by them.

field by them.

SEC. 11. Every bong Ade inhabitant of Kansan, on the third Sec. 11. Every bong Ade inhabitant of Kansan, on the third Monday of June, 1857, being a citizen of the United States, and over twenty-one years of age, whose residence in the county where he offers to vote shall have been three months next before said election, shall be entitled to vote.

SEC. 12. Persons authorized to take the census to administer eath, &c.

SEC. 13 provides for the punishment of unlawful attempts to influence voters.

eaths, &c.

SEC. 13 provides for the punishment of unlawful attempts to influence voters.

SEC. 14 provides punishment for illegal voting.

SEC. 15 provides punishment for those who fraudulently hinder a full repression of the popular vote.

SEC. 16. Delegates are required to assemble in convention at the capital on the first Monday of September in xt.

SEC. 17 provides for an election by the Convention of its offi-

ers.
SEC, 18. In relation to the salaries of sheriffs and other officers.
SEC, 19. Relative to the location of the election districts.
SEC, 20 requires all votes to be eith socs.
SEC 21 sives a tabular form for the returns.
Above bill passed over Governor's veto on the 19th of Pebrury 1857.

A relative of the voters was accordingly taxen, in pursuance the act of the Territorial Legislature, so lar as it was possible, under the peculiar state of things then existing, to do so. It appears that a portion of the inhibitants refused to be registered; some away factitions names, and others prevented the officers from complying with the law.

Mr. Stantels, then Acting-Governor of Kansas, says on that state of the control of the con

from con plying with the law.

Mr. Stantya, then Acting Governor of Kansas, says on that subject;

Wit is not my purpose to reply to your statement of facts; I cannot do so from any personal knowledge enabling me either to admit or deny them. I my say, however, I have heard statements of your own, and in some instances from members of your own party (Republicans), to the effect that your political friends have very generally—indeed, almost universally—retused to participate in the pending proceedings for registering the names of the legal voters. In some instances they have given fictitious names, and in numerous others they refused to give any names at all. You cannot deny that your party have heretofore resolved not to take part in the registration, and it appears to me that, without indulging ungenerous suspicions of the integrity of officers, you might well attribute any errors and omissions of the sheriffs to the existence of this well-known and controlling fact."

But, notwithstanding all bese difficulties in making the registry of voters, 3,251 names were legally returned in the following counties and districts, vis.: Doniphan, Brown, Nemaha, Atchison, Duciles, Snawnee, Lykins, Linn, Bourbon, McGee, Porr, Allen.

In the following counties—Richardson, Davis, Franklin, Weller, Breckennidge, Wise, Madison, Butler, Coffee, Anderson, Wooden, Wilson, Godfrey, Greenwood, Hunter, no registry was taken, on account of the facts above stated. All of the last named counties together contained but a very small population or vote. It is believed, from the statement made by General Calboan, now before the Committee, that many of these counties did not contain for soles and all of them tagether not so many as 1,500. The counties were marked out by a description of boundaries and named but a very small population or vote and a for them were without inhabitants, and many of them were stached of adjacent counties for civil and military purposes.

of them were a marked to appear commercial to the purpose a.

All of them were equally provided for by the law calling the Convention, and any our ission that may have occurred resulted from causes not in the control of the majority of the people.

The largest vote ever had in the Territory up to the first December bas is about 12 food. So that it appears from the facts before the Committee, notwithstanding the refused to comply with the law on the part of those opposed to it, only about \$0.000 less, could possibly have been omitted in the registration; and even that a mission was the result of their own acts.

One whole month was afterward allowed under the law, as before attack for the correction of the live after due nation to the

to outnumber their opponents at least ten to one, the prefect it assembling these forces to protect the polls is evidently most failacious."

It thus appears to the Committee, from official, evidence, that the opposition in Kansas to the Lecompton Convention consisted of persons engaged in insurrection, rebellion and revolution. Some few are known to be citizens of the United States. Whether the others are citizens or attent, whether in adlegiance or not, they are all known to be encuise of the Government, and openly engaged in attempts assiste that and order in the Territory, and against the peace and quiet of society. Many have been shown by Gov. Walker to be hired mercentries sets out by the Aboutton societies of the East, and all working in concert to accomplish in Kansas what the Supreme Court and public sentiment have decided Congress has no power to do; that is, to prehably Slavery in the Territory of Kansas, and, more than that, prevent the people of the Territory from exercising the privilege of deciding that question for themselves in their own way.

To do which they have gotten up military organizations of a rebellious character; have committed the most recolling outrages against persons and property; threatening to delaye the land in blood; alienating one section of the Union from another, and ensurering the existence of Free Government.

Such are the characters—such are the objects and dangerous results of the opponents of the Lecompton Constitution.

But, without regard to this insurrectionary movement, the regular leval Convention of Kansas, in pursuance of law, assembled and adopted the Constitution now before the Committee, which is the output of African Slavery, and to avoid all pretext of complaint on the part of opponents, the Convention, accepting the surgestion of Governor Stanton, submitted the question of Slavery or no Slavery to a direct vote of the bona 4de tinhabitant of the Territory. That election was ordered for the 21st December, 1357, when it was accordingly held, and resulted as

An opportunity has consequently been afforded to the people of Kansas to decide this question of Slavery for themselves, and that decision is now before us with all the sanctions of law. No real or valid exception can be taken to any other part of the Constitution, On this subject President Buchanan has well said in his Messavi.

Kamas to decide this question of Slavery for themselves, and take decision is now before us with all the sanctions of law. No real or vaile exception can be taken to any other part of the Constitution, Git this subject President Buchanan has well said in his Measure.

"In fact the general provisions of our recent State Constitutions, after an experience of eighty years, are so similar and so excelent that it would be difficult to go far wrong at the present day in framing a new Constitution."

The Constitution conforms precisely to what Gov. Walker said would meet his most cordial approval, and that be should devote his whole time in addresses every day to the people of every county in the Territory to insure its adoption. He says:

"Adopt a Constitution very similar to that of some of the Southern States, securing the right to the slaves now in the Territory, numbering probably from two to three hundred, but prohibiting the introduction of any more; excluding all free negroes; enforcing by most stringent provisions the execution of the Fugitive Slave law; securing the right of appeal in all constitutional cares to the Supreme Court of the United States; and requiring all officers of the Government—legislative, executive and judicial, the judges and inspectors of all elections, and the attorneys of all courts—to take an oash to support the Constitution, if submitted to a vote of the whole people, would, in my opinion, be adopted by a very considerable majority."

If will be seen that the Convention at Lecompton has adopted just such a Constitution, with the single exception of the clause prohibiting the introduction of any more layer; and that clause prohibiting the introduction of any more layer; and that clause prohibiting the continual of the single exception of the clause prohibiting the continual of the single exception of the clause prohibiting the continual of the single exception of the clause prohibiting the continual of the single exception of the people themselves registered and unregistered, thus le

they had voted, and then claim the privilege of having a resolving in?

It is were true that they had, as they assert, a majority opposed to Stavery, they could have voted out the claims sentiousing that institution. By their own act the claims is retained; and then they devine to reject the whole Constitution, because of the so-called chroxique Slavery cause, left in by their own which refusal to vote. Such whiteheast is not to be constituted or tolerated in a to vote. Such whiteheast is not to be constituted or tolerated in a to vote. Such whiteheast is not to be constituted or tolerated in a to vote. Such whiteheast is not to be constituted or tolerated in a time, and they have a strong of the same people to vote on all these trunties should be afforded to the same people to vote on all these due to the they have in the past. Who can anythey will so the same to be, they would not the same objection now make be as yalled then ast it is east, with reference to their soc-accion? It is not to be, however, but carrying out their snower political design to prevent the peaceful settlement of the quantum. The only legal rule is, to adhere to the sufform practice of all the Constitutions Governments in the Union; and an opportunity

cery conceivable way, and ended in holding elections upon days and in a manner unauthorized by law, and expressly to contrave the law.

When, at last, to end, hif possible, these disorders and strifes, the Legislature made provision for a vote of the people upon the question whether a State Government should be formed by the making and adopting of a Constitution, these organized disturbers combined to precent a full and jair cote. So, likewise, when the Convention had been ordered by a regular vote of the people to be called, the around mischief-makers three every obstacle in the way of a full registration of the settlers legally entitled to vote for members of the Convention of the settlers legally entitled to vote for members of the Convention of the settlers legally entitled to vote for members of the Convention of the settlers legally entitled to vote for members of the Convention of the settlers legally entitled to vote for members of the States to infer that the election of the members of the United States to infer that the election of the members of the Convention was neither legal nor fair? The people having, by direct vote, ordered the calling of a Convention to form a Constitution, the abolition agilators and disturbers refused to vote at the election of members of said Convention, and then, after an obstinate refused, raised an outery that the Convention was unjustly constituted, linamuch as they were not represented the rein. After the formation of a Constitution they cried out against the Convention, that the Convention has been clothed with full authority to make a Constitution, and that it rabiled the Convention to make a Constitution, and that it had been always, bad made great exertions to induce them to so to the polisible honest, law-abiding citizens, and vote for men who would respect their wishes, and that they had not have the obsting the solution of the Convention to make a Constitution, and that it had been made alaw after a full consideration of such vets. They knew that the Governor an

ways, bad made great exertions to induce them to go to the point like houses, law-shiding citizens, and vote for men who would respect their wishes, and that they had refused to head these so licitations.

They also knew that the Convention had not only afforded an opportunity for the good citizens who had registered themselves as veters according to law to decide whether Slavery should or should not be established in Kansas as a legal institution, but had also allowed even those bad men who had disobeyed the laws, and who had combined to prevent a full registration, to vote with the registered voters upon this vital question; and they also knew that they refused to vote, even under such circumstances, upon this proposition.

The Convention was called by a direct vote of the people in direct pursuance of law, the people, in pursuance of taw, subsequently elected a Convention to make a Constitution; and, in strict pursuance of all the forms observed by such Conventions, strict pursuance of all the forms observed by such Conventions, if recomfised by Congress, the supreme law of Kansas, and can only be changed by the people of Kansas, who, through their legal representatives, have thus formally created it. No Legalisters of Kansas, after the people had, inspursuance of all the forms of saw, called and elected a Constitutional Convention to make a Constitution, could legally interfere with it either to increase or to lessen its powers. The Convention by a Legalsture than could be restricted in its legitimate action by a Legalsture than could be restricted in its legitimate action by a Legalsture than could be people themselves be restricted had they been assembled, in prevent, in one great mass meeting, to make a Constitution for person, in one great mass meeting, to make a Constitution for their own government. Hence the work of that Convention was their own government. Hence the work of the Convention was second with the people is calsus unburited on the 1st December, 187, was a final vote; the Convention of the

of Kanasa inserted in their "Topeks Constitution" the following more objectionable provision, viz:

"AMENIMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE ZYL.

"SECTION I. All propositions for amendments to the Constitution shall be made by the General Assembly.

"SEC 2. A concurrence of two-thirds of the members elected to each Home shall be necessary, after which such proposed an endments shall be necessary, after which such proposed an endments shall be necessary, after which such proposed are endments shall be necessary, after which such proposed are endments shall be necessary, after which such proposed are endments and be new spacer in published, for at least six months proceeding the next election for Secators and Representatives, when such proposed amendment shall be again referred to the Legislature elected rext succeeding such publication. If passed by the second Legislature by a majority of two-thirds of the members elected to each House, such an endment shall be republished, as aforeastly for at least six months prior to the next necessary election, as which election such proposed amendments shall be su unitted to the propie for their approval or rejection, and if the majority of the absorters voting at such election shall adopt such amendments, the same shall become a part of the Constitution.

"SEC, 3. When more than one amendment is submitted at the same time, they shall be so submitted as to enable the electors to yote upon each amendment apparately.

"SEC, 4. No Convention for the formation of a new Constitution shall be called, and no amendment to the Constitution shall be, by the General Assembly, made before the year 1955, nor more than once in five years thereafter."

The second reply is this: Suppose the grisevance real, and that it ought to be redressed, it is unnecessary for Compress to unless that you for the tempt of the reserved the reserved for every supplies the grisevance real, and that it ought to be redressed, it is unnecessary for Compress to unless than once in five years thereafter."

"Sec. 4. No Convention for the formation of a new Constitution shall be called, and no amendment to the Constitution shall be, by the General Assembly, made before the year 1805, nor more than once in five years thereafter."

The second reply is this: Suppose the grievance real, and that it ought to be redressed, it is unnecessary for Congress to unlawfully interfere for that purpose, insamuch as the Lecompton Convention has provided a full, lawful and perfect remedy for awary conceivable grievance, and placed that remedy in the surrestricted has do of the majority of the people, by inserting in the Constitution of Kansas the following distinct and unequivocal recognition of power, viz:

"All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted fire these benefit, and therefore they have at all times an inalicable and herefore they have at all times an inalicable and medicable right to after, reform, or abolish their form of government, in such manner as they may think proper."

The Aboliticules of Kansas have thus far sought power by methods unknown to the law and by violence, and not through the reaceful agency of the ballot-box. Claiming to have a majority of the veters of the Territory, and therefore able to elect Legislatures and Conventions, they yet ask Congress to wroughly do far them what they may at legal times and legal places, right fully do for the medicas except the reservation to afflict the country with an attempt at placebode our revolution. Unless Congress will do for them what they assert they are numerous enough to do for themselves—that is, change or shotish their Constitution, and then yet missing the provided of the reservation of the stress of the Territory, and therefore able to elect Legislature and the provided of the provided of the successive of the reservation of the second of the provided of the second of the provided of the

dress of all their grievances, whether they be real or imaginary.

The Committee does not approve the ordinance accompanying the Constitution, and report sgainst its allowance but they do no regard it as any part of the Constitution, nor will lie approvale disapproval by Congress affect the validity of that Constitution the State be admitted into the Union as recommended.

In conclusion, this Committee is of opinion that where a Constitution of a newly formed State, created out of our own territory, is presented to Congress for admission into the Union, it is no part of the duty or privilege of Congress either to appeare a disapprove the Constitution itself, and its various provision, or any of them, but simply to see whether it be the significant them the newlytate; whether it be republic in form; whether the boundaries proposed be admissible; and whether the mander of inhabitants be sufficient to justify independent State organization.

AMERICANS ABROAD .- List of Americans registered at the Barking-office of the American-European Ex-press and Exchange Company, Paris, from Jan. 24 to

Feb. 4:

M. H. Burr, W. Winson, N. Eston, R. Rogera, S. E. Barrall, T. Schwartz, C. A. Bristed, D. R. Alware, Dr. F. C. Schwartz, C. A. Bristed, D. R. Alware, Dr. F. C. Schwartz and family, W. Knispp, Capt. Lines, M. H. Morrisons, J. B. Captinger, J. H. Vanderver, M. D., E. Varet, F. Roska, & C. Arstin, J. Sellgman, T. N. Dale, W. Whitlambt, p., New-York, J. K. Bartist, Wisconsin, H. McKim, Maryisand, W. E. Borlatson and family, W. M. Lilley, Ohlo, G. T. Simpson, Peanselman, G. G. Grasser, Massachusetta, P. Rector Smith, M. D., Kentucky, W. H. Bruner, M. D., California.